

REMARKS

Claims 1, 7 and 8 stand finally rejected in the Office Action of July 2, 2003. Applicants have amended claim 1. Upon entry of the amendments, claims 1, 7 and 8 remain pending.

Support for the amendments to claim 1 are found in the specification as filed, for example, at page 9, lines 8-22 and at page 13, lines 9-17, as well as Figure 3. No new matter has been introduced. Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, in the Final Rejection as containing new matter. In response, Applicants have deleted the phrase alleged to be new matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 1, 7 and 8 are also rejected in the Final Rejection under § 112, as indefinite. Applicants note that the alleged indefinite phrase of claim 1 is the same as cited by the Examiner as new matter. Because Applicants have deleted the phrase from claim 1, Applicants believe that the claims comply with § 112 requirements of definiteness. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,250,439 (the Musho reference) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,877,745 (the Hayes

reference). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as applied to the amended claims and request reconsideration.

For a rejection under § 103 over a combination of references to be sustained, the references when combined must teach or suggest every element of the claims. Rejections under § 103 may be avoided by amendments that add limitations not taught or disclosed in the references.

Amended claim 1 contains at least one element or limitation not disclosed or suggested in the Musho primary reference. Specifically, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite that the sensor device for which a method of manufacturing is provided has microelectrodes forming a two-dimensional array, and that the method includes a step of depositing the electro conductive polymer onto different regions of the two-dimensional array to produce a device specific to a group of chemicals. Applicants respectfully submit that such elements are neither nor taught nor suggested by a combination of the Musho and Hayes references. For this reason, Applicants respectfully submits that claims 1 and 7 are patentable in view of the references and respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim stands rejected as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,571,401 (the Lewis reference) in view of the Hayes reference. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as applied to the amended claims and request reconsideration.

As discussed above, claim 1 has been amended to recite a circuit with microelectrodes forming a two-dimensional array. Such a two-dimensional array of microelectrodes is neither taught nor suggested by a combination of the Lewis and Hayes references. For this reason, and for the reasons discussed above with respect to the Musho reference, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 7 and 8 are also rejected under § 103 over the Musho reference in view of the Hayes reference, and further in view of U.S. Patent 4,874,499 (the Smith reference). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as applied to the amended claims and request reconsideration.

As discussed above, the Musho and Hayes references do not teach or suggest the amended element of claim 1, that is that the microelectrodes form a two-dimensional array. Applicants respectfully submit that the teachings of the Smith reference are not sufficient to overcome the deficiencies of the Musho and Hayes references discussed above. Because the amended claims contain a limitation not taught or suggested by combination of the references cited, Applicants respectfully submit the claims are patentable over the references, and respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 7 and 8 are also rejected under § 103 as unpatentable over the Lewis reference in view of the Hayes reference and further in view of the Smith reference.


Claim 1, containing a limitation that microelectrodes form a two-dimensional array, is patentable over the Lewis and Hayes references for the reasons discussed above. The Smith reference is cited for the proposition that microsensors can be formed from a wide variety of materials. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that it does not overcome the deficiencies of the Lewis and Hayes references discussed above with respect to the subject matter of the amended claims. For this reason, Applicants respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed above, Applicants believe claims 1, 7 and 8 are in the state of allowability and respectfully request an early notice of such allowance. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if that would be helpful to resolving any issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Oct. 2, 2003

By: 
G. Gregory Schivley, Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade, Reg. No. 40,344
Attorneys for Applicants

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGs/BEW/MAF/cg